



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee**
of the
**Metropolitan Planning
Organization**
for the
Miami Urbanized Area

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Dr. Barry Burak

Louis Foster

Susan Kairalla

Christine Leduc

Amado Leon

Gabrielle Redfern

Claudia Schmid

Larry Thorson

Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1 Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-1647

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DON'T FORGET MAP TO SPCC ON E-MAIL PAGE

S.P. CLARK CENTER

111 NW 1 ST.

18FLOOR - CONFERENCE ROOM 2

MIAMI, FLORIDA 33128

NOTE ROOM
CHANGE

NOTE ROOM
CHANGE

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2006
AT 5:30 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF OCTOBER 25, 2006
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. MPO CALL FOR IDEAS - O. Camejo, MPO
 - B. MIAMI INTERMODAL CENTER – G. Donn, FDOT
 - C. B/P PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WORKSHOP – D. Henderson
 - D. M-DPW BIKEWAYS MAINTENANCE – J. Cohen, M-DPW
- IV. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. BPAC MEMBERSHIP REVIEW – D. Henderson
 - B. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - C. PROGRESS REPORTS – J. Manzella
- V. MEMBER COMMENTS

It is the policy of Miami Dade County to comply with all of the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The facility is accessible. For sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or materials in accessible format, please call 305-375-4507 at least five business days in advance.

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau
Christine Leduc
Amado Leon
Gabrielle Redfern
Claudia Schmid
Ted Silver
Eric Tullberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

Susan Kairalla
Larry Thorson
Louis Foster

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Jae Manzella, Staff
Oscar Camejo, MPO
Jeff Cohen, M-DPW
Gary Donn, FDOT

Ricardo Fernandez, ET/MIC Mgmt. Grp.
Irwin Seltzer, Cyclist
Nadia Mishkovsky, Citizen

The meeting began at 5:45 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- ET: Corrected that limits for the Biscayne Trl. extension phase were SW "248"-328 Sts. BB: Corrected that he "suggested" the FDOT B/P Coordinator to present projects. <i>Motion approving the revised Minutes of 10/25/6; seconded by AL; vote – unanimous.</i>
MPO CALL FOR IDEAS	- OC: He is soliciting ideas for the FY 2007 UPWP, which starts 7/1/7 thru 6/30/8. Several projects originated from the UPWP, such as: the M-Path Master Plan, the Comprehensive Bicycle Safety Program, Snake Creek Canal Bikeway, etc. He handed-out documentation explaining the program. Submissions can come by fax, e-mail, land-mail, etc. ET: Suggested responding to all submissions; this would encourage more participation. OC: <i>Agreed.</i> The average yearly submission is around 30; representing 10% of the overall approved projects; the majority come from agency staff. The UPWP Committee reviews all of them with specific criteria, searching for fatal flaws, etc. The public can watch the process; but, it is not open for public debate. Members of the committee are appointed by the TPC; they represent various transportation-related agencies, as well as municipalities.
MIAMI INTERMODAL CENTER	- GD: The focus tonight will be Central Station. The PD&E stage is over, and detailed designs are being developed. Some of the proposals the BPAC made previously have been included. He handed out an updated brochure of the MIC project. Construction is still several years away, although it will be phased-in. RF: (Referring to diagrams he handed-out.) The bike station concept is integrated into the Central Station. Tri-Rail, Metrorail, Metrobus, and intercity buses will all stop at the same location. MDT is designing their terminal. A central walkway connects the entire site, including the people-mover station. <i>Most of the bike parking would be situated along the central promenade</i> , at ground level, which connects to the car parking areas. Just east of this site will be joint-use, such as: a hotel, conference facilities, restaurants, offices, retail, etc. <i>A bike station would be provided within the Central Station, near showers and lockers.</i> The promenade will showcase artworks. Members of the project team visited Millennium Park in Chicago, which has a very successful bike station with 2 repair shops and rentals. An organization runs their station. They tried a kiosk at Bayside; but, it was unsuccessful. For the MIC bike station to be successful, it needs an entity to run it. GR: Inquired if the RFP includes this provision. RF: This is his opinion, which the rest of the project team needs to discuss. The Chicago

station requires membership. They only have 4 showers and 20 changing lockers; yet, there are hundreds of bicycles parked there on double-deck racks. It is often the starting point for bike tours; as well as an information center.

JM: Inquired if MIA bicycle-commuting workers were surveyed; or if there is an area for them to park. Otherwise, bike station racks would be filled with employee bikes.

RF: A commuting survey has not been done, yet.

DH: Aware of a bike rack at Concourse G.

RF: There may be another 50 spaces (racks) along the promenade as well.

TS: Agreed that a survey would be useful to gauge existing bicycle-commuting, as well as encourage more bicycle use. A separate area for employees' bikes seems practical.

GD: *This will be considered.*

JC: *Suggested that the sidewalk ramps be at least 8' to accommodate bicycles entering/existing the area.* Currently, they are sub-standard, since bicycles are expected to use them. *The ramps leading to both NW 21st and 25th Sts. needs complimentary cross-striping, and hopefully cross signals.* NW 25 St. is a heavy truck route. Inquired about the height of the train platforms to conform with train exit heights.

RF: Each platform conforms to their respective train exit heights. *All the elevators will accommodate bicycles*, as well as smart-carts, which are even more cumbersome.

ET: Suggested the use of inverted-U bike racks.

RF: *Those are being specified.*

ET: *Requested the racks to be placed in high-visibility areas, and preferably covered.*

CS: Chains corrode faster when sitting in the rain.

TS: Concerned that a lack of a covered, parking lot walkway would discourage use.

GD: MDT doesn't expect many passengers arriving by car. Most of the parking use will be from Tri-Rail patrons. Most existing *transit stations do not have covered walkways.* This can be reviewed.

JM: Suggested the promenade to be covered, because it connects all the parking areas.

GD: That would make it a hallway, where it is conceived to be an open space.

TS: *Requested more-consolidated bike parking in a covered area for most of the bikes.*

GD: The Bike Station area has racks that are covered. There aren't any lockers planned. A storage room is possible. Lockers get vandalized and the homeless use them. The storage room could be accessible by key-card.

GR: Inquired if informational kiosks would be installed to foretell when buses will arrive.

GD: Yes. These will be integrated with the bus' GPS systems.

NM: There are bike racks that serve as art as well. The way the racks are positioned along the promenade, it seems as if bikes may become obstructions. Suggested staggering the racks along the promenade.

GD: *They are planned to do so.* The promenade is approx. 25' wide.

DH: Cautioned against placing racks far from the station. Consolidating them is preferred.

GD: The rendering depicts them all the way down the promenade as an example of what amenities can be made available. Further consolidating them seems reasonable.

NM: Noted that some sidewalks don't have curb-cuts in the drawing.

GD: The project team needs to further develop the routing system for entering/existing the area. It is bordered by high-traffic roads. *This is the next phase of design.*

BB: Thanked the team for considering and including some of the amenities the BPAC suggested in prior meetings. Inquired how many shower stalls would be available.

RF: *There will be 6;* more than there is available in Millennium Park.

BB: Reminded the project team that connections along NW 25 St. to the future Miami

	<p>River Greenway should be kept in mind. Additionally, NW 37 Av. should be made bicycle-friendly with wide sidewalks and bike lanes.</p> <p>GD: NW 37 Av. should be bicycle-friendly. Although these details have not been set, once the joint-development is conceived, <i>provisions can be included into the agreements.</i></p> <p>JC: Using the west-side of NW 37 Av. would accommodate a path within the park, which would connect to the existing path along NW 14 St. SFWMD has been accommodating bicycle use along their canals. Suggested extending the promenade south to the Tamiami Canal; then, including a path on the northern shoreline to both NW 42nd & 37th Aves. This could also tie into a perimeter path around the golf course.</p> <p>GD: <i>Will consider these options with the project team.</i></p> <p>JC: The Perimeter Trl. was supposed to link many of the NDGP trails. But, Airport officials convinced the FAA that a bike trail near the airport was a security threat. That decision brought a lack of continuity to these proposed trails.</p> <p>GD: <i>Routing bicyclists and pedestrians in/out of the MIC will be further researched.</i></p> <p>DH: Providing a suitable crossing of LeJeune Rd. will be a task. He is also concerned with the connections of future trails.</p> <p>GD: Connecting to Grapeland Hts. Park is an obvious goal.</p> <p>JC: Since there aren't sidewalks on LeJeune Rd., north of NW 14 St., He is concerned with connectivity. <i>The project team should review routing for non-motorized travel.</i></p> <p>GR: Concerned that the ground route from MIA to the MIC is hazardous.</p> <p>BB: The city of Miami remains worst in the nation for pedestrians hit by automobiles. Last month, the BPAC was presented with a SW 27 Av. plan that had bike lanes. However, the same corridor north of US-1 was redone without bike lanes, but wide medians. This project wasn't presented to the BPAC. <i>He asked for more FDOT projects to come before the group for comments.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>Requested when a municipality takes control over a roadway, that the agreement stipulates the consideration of bicycle mobility.</i></p> <p>GD: Transferring responsibility of a roadway is a rare occurrence.</p> <p>JM: The brochure depicts the transportation directional signage for the MIC; bicycles aren't included. It also depicts the "improved" LeJeune Rd.; there seems to be enough space to provide a greenway for that long corridor.</p>
B/P PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WORKSHOP	<p>- DH: There are several ways bicycle facilities are developed; the recently-presented UPWP is one; the Bicycle Master Plan identifies options; and, sometimes automobile-oriented projects also incorporate bikeways. (He passed-out copies of the 2007 TIP.) The TIP represents all the funded surface transportation projects for the State and County, except for GO bond expenditures and minor projects taken-on by municipalities. Members are encouraged to review the document and inquire about specific projects. <i>He will provide information or set-up a presentation.</i></p> <p>GR: Inquired about improvements along the J. Tuttle Cswy.</p> <p>DH: The causeway itself is Limited Access. A path cannot be included; (other than the path on the south side, just east of the actual causeway.) There have been discussions regarding allowing the FDOT to determine which facilities could be included within Limited Access ROW. There are technical criteria for these designations. <i>A list of accronyms used in the TIP will be provided to assist members.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>This list should also include what the terms mean, as well as what they stand for.</i></p> <p>ET: Would like to know all the funding sources; as well as how much has been spent over the last 5 years in each category.</p> <p>TS: Considers this proposal to be too fine a level of detail for the workshop.</p> <p>ET: People would want to know how much available funding there is.</p>

	<p>TS: Prefers to keep the workshop focused upon the “concept to concrete” process.</p> <p>DH: A rough tally for the Federal share of funds over the next 4 years is \$830 million.</p> <p>JM: Regarding the J. Tuttle Cswy., the designation could be changed through the legislature (to construct a bikeway).</p> <p>GR: Prefers to concentrate on improvements for the MacArthur Cswy., since it leads to Watson Island and the Childrens’ Museum.</p> <p>TS: It’s hard just to get it maintained in a suitable manner.</p> <p>BB: Inquired about the request to have legislative issues reviewed at today’s meeting.</p> <p>DH: He planned to incorporate this. However, other job responsibilities cut into his activities for the BPAC. (He passed-out the legislative statute.)</p> <p>BB: <i>Requested this item to be placed on the next agenda.</i> The BPAC should consider whether to take-on this issue to strengthen this law.</p> <p>TS: Section 1a uses the word “shall” for considering bicycle mobility; but, 1b provides four provisions that give engineers a way out of this requirement. <i>This is the first thing the BPAC should focus upon: narrowing these exceptions.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>He will continue to look for last year’s legislative proposal to strengthen this requirement.</i> Other municipalities are making an issue on how the FDOT documents their justification for exclusion of bicycle-friendly design.</p>
<p>M-DPW BIKEWAYS MAINTENANCE</p>	<p>- JC: He doesn't have a maintenance presentation, other than informing the group that <i>an M-DPW maintenance meeting will take place next week.</i></p> <p>ET: Inquired if he had a list of bikeways with details, such as when they were constructed. This would aid in the planning of maintenance.</p> <p>JC: <i>Maintenance procedures will be developed under the assumption that all N&SDGN have been built.</i> For working purposes, this is an assumption of 600 miles. Also, assuming that M-DPW will be maintaining most of these; and that more on-road facilities will be developed. As wide curb-lanes are transfigured to bike lanes, more maintenance is required, because automobile wind-blasts will not be sweeping debris into the gutter. <i>A review of existing equipment will be done to determine what else is necessary. Field reviews will be done to determine the scope of repairs necessary.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired if there was a process to prioritize repairs.</p> <p>JC: <i>Existing trails (using existing equipment/funding) will be focused upon. Maintenance crews will be given more responsibility to sweep paths. An equitable distribution of service will be attempted.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>Would prefer that more-damaged facilities receive a higher priority.</i> This could be done by field surveys; which makes it important to identify where all the paths are.</p> <p>JC: <i>Agrees;</i> it is important to get all the paths to an equal condition. Simple maintenance, such as sweeping/vegetation removal can be done by M-DPW; but, repairs are done by the owning agency, such as: MDT, M-DP&R, etc.</p> <p>TS: <i>The BPAC needs a list that identifies each path’s respective owner,</i> so that M-DPW isn’t the only entity being called upon.</p> <p>JC: <i>Agrees</i> that a Master List is important. A piece of the path along 117 Av. was converted to a sidewalk, because no one had it listed as a path.</p> <p>TS: Recommended M-DPW to allow ET to assist in the review of paths, once this procedure is ready to be taken on.</p> <p>BB: It sounds like there is a lot of work to be done. Perhaps a UPWP study could be made for a maintenance assessment.</p> <p>DH: Not sure that the level of work required would be so extensive. Some details have been determined, and <i>after meetings with the M-DPW Maintenance Division, more details/procedures will be programmed.</i></p> <p>JC: A lot of procedures were proposed, they just didn’t make it into the budget.</p>

	<p>DH: It's more of a budget issue than a planning need.</p> <p>JC: Regarding the Venetian Cswy.: since Thanksgiving is coming-up, it will delay the improvements. However, <i>bicycle lanes from the toll plaza to Purdy Av. will be installed within 3 weeks.</i> Regarding the Rickenbacker Cswy.: handrails along the entire Powell bridge will cost so much that the budget goes over fast-track parameters. There may be an opportunity to separate some of the work to stay within a fast-track budget. All the medians have been cut-back to reduce hazards.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if SW 107/112/117 Aves., north of SW 328 St. are planned for resurfacing. This is a route many cyclists use; but, the pavement is broken-up.</p> <p>JC: <i>He will ask for a field review of this area to be done.</i> Unfortunately, a proposed path along SW 127 Av., from Kendall Dr. to SW 120 St. on the east side, was denied because FPL would not respond to the request to provide an easement. <i>A path will still be constructed from SW 104/120 Sts. Wide curb-lanes will be provided north to Kendall Dr.; and the southern portion of the project will also include a frontage road.</i> FPL uses this stalling tactic to avoid being seen as anti-community. <i>SW 48 St., between SW 87/117 Aves., will have bike lanes.</i> A consultant is being sought for this project.</p> <p>ET: He has been hoping to obtain a comprehensive map of all the paths within the county.</p> <p>DH: <i>A large-format map is underway.</i> Detailed information has yet to be put together.</p> <p>GR: Inquired if ET was hoping to obtain a detailed network map/list, such as the documentation the City of Doral provided.</p> <p>ET: Yes; but something that the public could be provided as well.</p> <p>TS: Suggested that researching/gathering details/reports of when all paths were built or repaired last to be superfluous. It would be a better use of time to field survey existing conditions to access what needs to be done. The old information may not be reliable.</p>
BPAC MEMBER REVIEW	<p>- DH: Every year, member attendance is reviewed, as per the by-law requirements. No one has surpassed non-attendance limits. Members are provided only 3 non-excused or 5 total absence opportunities each year.</p> <p>JM: This is why it is important for members to reply to his R.S.V.P. calls.</p> <p>DH: Two new appointments have been made at the last MPO Governing Board meeting. Regarding the use of the Commission Chambers, the MPO's Deputy Director has asked for a BPAC resolution. Some members of the BPAC do not want this change.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested this to be the first item for next month,</i> since some members have left.</p> <p>JM: Suggested doing televised meetings every quarter.</p> <p>BB: Inquired if any present members had issues with televised meetings.</p> <p>ET: Agreed that these would increase BPAC recognition; however, discussions/questions with consultants, etc. would have to be better structured. He is also worried that low attendance would present a low-favorability of the group.</p> <p>IS: Agrees that it is depressing that there are so few members of the public that attend.</p> <p>DH: The meetings would not be on the 4th Wednesday, because the CTAC already has reserved the Chambers for those days.</p>
MEMBER COMMENTS	<p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ET: The S. Dade Trl. southern ending is being configured wrong. • JC: He has pointed this out to FDOT, and they are reviewing the design again. • GR: <i>Motion to include bike lanes along SW 216 St., from SW 112 Av. to Old Cutler Rd.; expanding the proposed bike lanes from SW 112/127 Aves.; seconded by ET.</i> <p>ET: The easiest way would be to reduce the travel lanes' width; otherwise, the wide medians can be reduced along this 110' ROW. The existing bridge has paved shoulders already. This would also connect to the Black Creek Trl.</p> <p>DH: This would be a separate project and funds would have to be programmed.</p>

TS: *Friendly amendment to include ET's suggestions within the resolution.*

GR: *Accepted the amendment; vote – unanimous.*

- DH: A consultant has been hired to perform a B/P counts at various locations throughout the urbanized area. *A series will be done in January, and another in July. The locations are being determined; the BPAC will have an opportunity to comment.*
- ET: He is the Vice-Chair of the Biscayne-Everglades Greenway Mowry Section Canal Crossings group. They had a meeting in November.
- ET: He has also notified the appropriate agencies of some sidewalk repairs needed in Southern Miami-Dade. He has successfully made the City of Homestead address creeping vegetation issues near the school.
- ET: Several Metrorail stations have received more bike racks. *MDT should be commended for placing them in an appropriate, accessible configuration.*
- BB: Concerned with the Flagler St. project options for bike lanes. This is a \$7 million project. Inquired about a presentation to the BPAC.
DH: He has tried to gather bike counts and other pertinent information to justify bike lanes. The Project Mgr. has asked to table the November presentation; so, *he will request a December presentation.*
- BB: There are 12 projects defined as “Pedestrian Safety Improvements” in the FDOT section of the TIP. *He requested a presentation on these.*
DH: *Has asked Ken Jeffries to do so.*
- TS: Inquired if members would rather move the December meeting up one week.
ET: Since the November meeting was moved-up, and Christmas is so near; yes.
TS: *Requested the BPAC meeting to be held on December 13, 2006.*
DH: Will have to confirm a room will be available.

- *The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.*